

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I might just take a moment of time here to thank the Senator from West Virginia. His kind words are high praise indeed.

This Washington, DC, has many museums which contain many national treasures, but the Senate has its own treasure in the Senator from West Virginia, and his dedication to this institution is just unparalleled. The fact that he would praise us for staying after 9 o'clock to do our job of course is belied by the fact that he is still here, prepared to say a few words as well, doing his job, as he always does, for the people of West Virginia.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia, as well as my colleague from Texas, for their kindnesses during consideration of this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think we need to pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on final passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 1283) was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives the companion bill to S. 1283, the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of that measure, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of the Senate bill, S. 1283, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof, that the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed, that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 1283, not be engrossed, that it remain at the desk pending receipt of the House companion bill, and that upon passage by the Senate of the House bill as amended, the passage of S. 1283 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to thank profusely the staff who have worked so hard on this bill. As Senator BYRD said earlier, this takes a lot of time, because there are a lot of issues that are affected by this bill. I want to thank Mary Beth Nethercutt on the Appropriations Committee and Terry Sauvain, her counterpart on the minority side. They have done a wonderful job making sure that all the t's are crossed and the i's are dotted and the agreements are made and the agreements to disagree are put on the table. They have done a wonderful job.

On my staff, my legislative director Jim Hyland and Robb Woodson, who is

the legislative assistant who has done so much to try to make sure that this is a very good and solid bill supporting the District of Columbia.

With that, Mr. President, I thank everyone for a job well done and appreciate once again Senator DURBIN's co-operation. We have had a great relationship. We have agreed to disagree on some issues, but I think he speaks from the heart, and I understand, even when we disagree, that we want the same goal. For that reason, I know we will have a good bill to come back out of conference for the Senate to adopt, and then we will continue to work with the District government to make sure our views are implemented and their views are implemented.

I yield the floor.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 1186, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of amendment No. 1186, previously agreed to within the foreign operations appropriations bill.

I ask unanimous consent the amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1186), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 599C. The Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, (1) effect the United States participation in the fifth general capital increase of the African Development Bank, the first general capital increase of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the first general capital increase of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; (2) contribute on behalf of the United States to the eighth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund, the twelfth replenishment of the International Development Association. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury: \$40,847,011 for paid-in capital, and \$639,932,485 for callable capital, of the African Development Bank; \$29,870,087 for paid-in capital, and \$139,365,533 for callable capital, of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency; \$125,180,000 for paid-in capital of the Inter-American Investment Corporation; \$300,000,000 for the African Development Fund; \$2,410,000,000 for the International Development Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask for recognition to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOVERY OF SALMON RUNS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, a thoughtful and detailed article appeared about a week ago in the Portland Oregonian indicating public expenditures of close to \$1 billion during the current year directed at the recovery of salmon runs in the Pacific Northwest. That is an extraordinarily large amount of money for a purpose of that nature.

A modest portion of it comes from State appropriations of the four States in the Columbia River drainage area. The largest single share of that almost \$1 billion is paid for through the charges for electric power produced by the Bonneville Power Administration and others, and, therefore, by the residents of the region, but a very substantial share of that money comes from appropriations approved by this Congress.

As recently as 1 year or 18 months ago, I and many others in the region were critical of the billions of dollars of spending for this purpose on the grounds that they had shown few, if any results, and that, in fact, salmon runs had declined during that period of time.

That criticism is no longer entirely correct. We have had some recent successes, and I will mention a few of them in just a moment. But I think all would agree that those successes are not at this point a proper return on an investment of almost \$1 billion a year.

For example, with the aid and assistance of my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, the Interior appropriations bill for the current year included \$20 million appropriated to the State of Washington for these purposes. And this Senator has to confess that he is not entirely certain what the people of the United States have gotten for that \$20 million at this point.

This Senator cannot point to a single significant success as a result. Part of the reason, of course, is that in the current year, the spending of that money has not been completed. Part of it is that the programs which it funds are new, and part of it is the fact that the very nature of the salmon resource requires a number of years to tell whether or not any positive results will take place. But nonetheless, we are faced with that very real challenge of determining whether or not we are getting our money's worth out of these investments.

For the next year, for fiscal year 2000, I can identify in our own work in this body significant amounts of money coming from the energy and water appropriations bill, especially through the Army Corps of Engineers, through the agriculture appropriations bill, through the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill, particularly

close to \$100 million for the enforcement and maintenance of a recent treaty signed with Canada on the subject of salmon in the Northwest, through the Environmental Protection Agency, and once again, through the appropriations bill the Senator from West Virginia and I will manage for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

In addition, of course, there will be those huge amounts of money, close to half a billion dollars a year, through rates charged for electricity by the Bonneville Power Administration and somewhat enhanced appropriations from the four States.

There are many, and I have been occasionally tempted toward this position myself, who will say that if we are not getting our money's worth and if there are so many different entities spending money on salmon recovery, would it not be appropriate to have a single federally appointed salmon czar who would determine how all of this money would be spent.

The argument for that proposition, I think, would be much stronger if there were a single salmon science; that is to say, if we knew precisely what we were doing, if there were one accepted way of getting the most for our money in connection with salmon recovery.

Of course, at this point, there is not. There are serious, well-founded debates throughout the country and in the Pacific Northwest as to various, widely different policy prescriptions for salmon recovery.

To have one decisionmaker for all of these expenditures is perhaps not wise, at least until we have learned a good deal more about how we go about attaining our goals.

I do think, however, there could be considerably more coordination than there is at the present time. Three years ago, I persuaded the Congress, as a rider on an appropriations bill, to create an independent scientific review board to advise the Bonneville Power Administration on how to spend the more than \$100 million a year in actual cash grants that it gives for salmon recovery. I had learned in the previous year that those decisions were made by various self-interested parties who awarded almost all of the money themselves without any discernible positive impact at all, and the situation with respect to that roughly 10 percent of the money spent on salmon recovery has been considerably improved by that independent scientific review.

I introduced a bill this year that would expand its authority to all the decisions made by the Bonneville Power Administration, not just direct money grants, but revenue foregone from its power cells, and I hope that the Congress will soon consider and pass that proposal.

Nevertheless, there remains a great deal of room for additional experimentation in connection with salmon recovery.

The bill which will be presented by the Senator from West Virginia and

myself in a few weeks for the Department of the Interior will include a modest \$4 million figure that will not go directly to the State of Washington, in this case, but will go, I hope, through a nonprofit organization which tells us that it can more than match the amount of money that we will appropriate and will direct most of its money at private volunteer citizen organizations.

I have found that those organizations do give us very much value for the money. Earlier this year, one local group of salmon recovery volunteers joined forces with a landowner on Snow Creek in my State. They received the cooperation of the Association of General Contractors in the State of Washington, an association that has a huge investment in connection with salmon recovery because of the impact of the Endangered Species Act on its ability to build.

Together, these volunteer organizations and private donors and representatives of the building industry have come up with an extremely constructive and almost certainly effective salmon recovery plan for a single stream. Like them, an organization of volunteers called Long Live the Kings is one of the dozen or more such organizations in the State of Washington, each of which is working on a single stream or group of streams with tremendous volunteer labor and great enthusiasm. Aid and assistance to them without detailed regulation from the State seems to me to be a wise investment of a modest portion of our money in this respect.

There are some in this body and others who say this is a regional problem and it should be paid for entirely by the region itself. And certainly the people of the Pacific Northwest put a very high value on salmon recovery.

But the way in which they must approach that salmon recovery is governed almost entirely, some would say distorted, by the Endangered Species Act, an act of the Congress of the United States which is both broad in one sense and very narrow in another sense in its scope, and governs many decisions in the State far beyond simply the management of our waters and of our salmon recovery itself.

So the Federal Government, having imposed these requirements, has an obligation at least substantially to help fund them. Nevertheless, I am here today to say that while this is a very high priority of the Congress, an extremely high priority of the people in my State and the other States in the Columbia River Basin, it is one on which we know and believe we should be held accountable by the Congress. We will do the best job we possibly can with the moneys appropriated by Congress or directed by Congress to see to it that we are successful.

Recent listings in the Puget Sound area now have the Endangered Species Act, for the first time, as having an immense impact on a major metropolitan

area in the United States. The people of my State are eager to take on that task. They have asked for modest help from us here. We are giving them that modest help. We will keep Congress and the people of the United States advised of how well we are doing with the generous assistance that my colleagues have helped me to provide.

THE ALABAMA STURGEON

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the story of the efforts to protect the Alabama Sturgeon has been a very long and very ugly one. For many years Congress has been involved. Just three years ago, Congress thought they had put an end to the listing battle when a partnership was formed between the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the Alabama Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. A five-year recovery plan was established to repopulate the Tennessee-Tombigbee with Sturgeon. Now this program has fallen to pieces, because the FWS pulled the plug by taking the dedicated funds and proceeding directly to a formal listing under the Endangered Species Act.

The FWS needs to do the right thing. For me, this means the FWS should honor the partnership it set up with Alabama's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. This program is at year three of a 5-year program and there is no evidence that the state of Alabama was performing poorly. However, it is clear the FWS wants to renege on the deal. Renege on a program that provides more direct and dedicated funding, and thus more resources, for the Alabama Sturgeon restoration than any funds the Fish and Wildlife Service spent under its own auspices. This simply does not make fiscal or scientific sense.

In both 1993 and 1994 Congress opposed the endangered species listing of the Alabama Sturgeon because of the lack of sound science. Congress also recognized the tremendous economic impact this listing would have on our region. The listing would have caused billions of dollars in river commerce to be disrupted. Nothing has changed in six years—no new science—no difference in the economic impact.

The FWS promised that the habitat designation will not require the stopping of dredging. However, someone forgot to tell the FWS office in Daphne, Alabama, what their position is supposed to be. The FWS office in Daphne, Alabama, has stated in writing that maintenance dredging will harm the sturgeon, and thus must not occur. I ask unanimous consent that the attached letter written to the Mobile, Alabama, office of the Army Corps of Engineers on June 17, 1999, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: